

REMARKS

Careful consideration has been given by the applicants to the Examiner's comments and rejection of the claims, as set forth in the outstanding Office Action, and favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application, as amended, is earnestly solicited.

Applicants note the Examiner's objections to the claims with regard to minor points of grammatical terminology and appropriate amendatory action has been taken to render that particular objection moot.

Furthermore, applicants note the rejection of Claims 1, 3 and 7-11 as being unpatentable over Fleischmann, U.S. Patent No. 6,203,180 B1, which is applicants' own earlier U.S. publication in view of Bello, Jr., U.S. Patent No 6,481,877 B1, and Kazar, U.S. Patent No. 5,008,595, as detailed in the Office Action.

However, in connection with the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as pending herein and as amended, and the newly presented Claims 12-27 are deemed to clearly and unambiguously distinguish over the art, irrespective as to whether the latter is considered singly or in combination.

Concerning Claim 1, applicants note that the prior art, even if combined, fails to provide features which could be deemed to anticipate or render obvious the present invention as set forth in the claim. None of these publications disclose in any manner that the regulating modules are maintaining the current through the light diodes of the corresponding lighting units at the same constant remaining value. The transistors TR1 through TR10, which the Examiner has deemed to be regulating modules in Bello, Jr., switch respectively (possibly also control) the current through the light diodes L1 through L10. However, this does not relate to a regulating module, inasmuch as there is no presence of any regulating loop, in effect, there is no feedback of a regulating signal

from the current circuit, which is to be regulated (that passing through the corresponding light diode). There is no suggestion or indication in Bello, Jr. that the current is measured through the light diodes L1 through L10 and that this measured value is utilized for the regulation of the current by means of the transistors TR1 through TR10 to a predetermined constant value. Consequently, the transistors TR1 through TR10 disclosed in Bello, Jr. cannot be deemed to be regulating modules in the sense of the present invention, which in the present instance, maintain current through the light diodes at a constant value.

Furthermore, reverting to Kazar, a maintenance of a constant current, as in the present case, is also not disclosed in that publication. In Kazar, there is merely a cursory mention that light diodes are controlled by means of pulse width modulation, which merely signifies that they can be switched on and off at a specified frequency, whereby the period duration from the switching on and switching off time period remains constant, and a change in the relationship between the switching on and switching off time period controls the average brightness of the light diode. To which particular value the current that flows through the light diodes during the switching on period is regulated, is not monitored in Kazar. Consequently, in Kazar, there cannot be ascertained any regulation of the light diode current to a constant remaining value which would be applicable to the context of the present invention.

With regard to Fleischmann, et al., this publication by the present applicants also does not address itself to that particular aspect, and even the combination of Fleischmann, et al., Bello, Jr., and Kazar would not lead one of average skill in the art to the subject matter of the present Claim1.

In addition thereto, the combination of these three publications would not be considered obvious to one skilled in the art, because the latter is generally an average college-trained engineer

conversant in the area of aircraft cabin illumination technology, would not at all consider in any manner the state of the technology pursuant to Bello, Jr. to be relevant, and which relates to floor mats for automobiles. This is because in aircraft cabins, a lighting system has nothing in common or compatible with such automobile floor mats, and in any event, illuminated automobile floor mats would not be adaptable in any manner for the internal lighting of an aircraft cabin.

In turn, again, Kazar describes the actuation of two color LEDs for ornamental and decorative illuminating displays. However, this does not relate to the internal illumination of a space or respectively an aircraft cabin, inasmuch as one of skill in the art in the technology of aircraft cabin internal illumination design would also not utilize this particular type of publication or combine it with the state of the art pursuant to Fleischmann, et al.

In view of the foregoing, it would not be obvious to one of skill in the art to provide for a combination of the three publications of Fleischmann, et al., Bello, Jr. and Kazar without having to inventively improve upon the foregoing disclosures.

In addition to the foregoing, applicants also enclose two further independent claims, New Claims 12 and 20, and dependent claims which relate to those claims and which are considered to be inventive and patentable. In these claims, the construction of the lighting system with the lighting units and regulating modules is described in another manner and the feature of the series connection of the light diodes is omitted. Moreover, in the first additional independent claim, Claim 12, the feature of the pulse width modulation is eliminated and made the subject matter of a dependent claim so that in this instance alone, there takes place the actuation of the light diodes through the regulating modules to a constant current flow. In contrast therewith, in the second additional new independent claims, Claim 20, there is illuminated the feature of the constant current regulation and in lieu thereof incorporated the pulse width modulation with the constant


current regulation being the subject matter of a dependent claim.

Also, these independent claims and the claims which are dependent therefrom, in effect, new Claims 12-27, are deemed to be inventive and patentable over the art, irrespective as to whether the latter is considered singly or in combination.

In summation, applicants respectfully submit that none of the prior art publications cited by the Examiner, irrespective as to whether considered singly or in combination with each other, are deemed to be applicable to the inventive concept, nor do these publications render the present invention obvious to one skilled in the technology, as also set forth in the present amended and newly presented claims.

In view of the foregoing, the early issuance of the Notice of Allowance by the Examiner is earnestly solicited. However, in the event that the Examiner has any queries concerning the instantly submitted Amendment, applicants' attorney respectfully requests that he be accorded the courtesy of possibly a telephone conference to discuss any matters in need of attention.

Respectfully submitted,



Leopold Presser
Registration No. 19,827
Attorney for Applicants

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza – Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

LP:jy